

REMARKS**I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-27 and 86 are all the claims currently pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 42-67 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1, 15 and 25 have been amended and claim 86 has been newly added. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Thus, entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

II. Response To Objections To IDS Filed On January 25, 2005:

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the IDS filed on January 25, 2005, lacks a discussion regarding the relevance of the Japanese references as indicated in the Japanese Office Action. Accordingly, the Applicant will provide a translation of the Japanese Office Action in due course.

III. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 15, 17, 19, 21, 42-44, 46, 49-50, 54-57, 59, 62-63 and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Orito (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,912, hereafter Orito) in view of Arimoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,371,613, hereafter Arimoto). Claims 4, 9-14, 18 and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Orito in view of Arimoto and Kamisuwa (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,008 B1, hereafter Kamisuwa). Claims 2, 6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Orito in view of Arimoto and Ohta (U.S. Patent No. 5,875,260, hereafter Ohta). Claims 7 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Orito in view of Arimoto, Kamisuwa and Sugiura (U.S. Patent No. 4,679,074, hereafter Sugiura). Claims 47, 51-52, 60 and 64-65 stand rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Orito in view of Arimoto and Sugiura.

Claims 45, 48, 53, 58, 61 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Orito in view of Arimoto and Taguchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,106, hereafter Taguchi).

In Office Action, the Examiner relies on Orito in view of Arimoto as the main references for rejecting the claims of the present invention. To expedite prosecution, the Applicant has herein amended the claims to further distinguish the present invention from Orito and Arimoto.

As amended, the present invention as described in claims 1 and 15 is characterized in that image correction performed in the image processing apparatus has nothing to do with shading correction. More specifically, a shading correction unit which performs shading correction on image data output from an image sensing unit is provided in the image sensing apparatus. The image sensing apparatus transmits to an image processing apparatus data on image sensing characteristics (such as the one shown in Fig. 2), which is different from shading correction data stored in the image sensing apparatus. In turn, the image processing apparatus generates image sensing characteristic correction data and, using this correction data, corrects influence of image sensing characteristics on the shading-corrected image data transmitted from the image sensing apparatus.

By contrast, Orito transmits from an image scanner to a host computer eight sets of white level data and eight sets of black level data, then calculates white average levels W1-W1684 and black average levels B1-B1684, which respectively correspond to first through 1684-th CCDs (see column 10, lines 2-18). Then, the tone data, obtained by scanning an original, is corrected to either one of the 256 levels from "00" to "FF" using the white and black average levels of the corresponding CCD position (see column 10, lines 18-22). Thus, it is apparent that what the host computer performs using the eight sets of white level data and eight sets of black level data is

shading correction. To that end, Orito merely teaches that shading correction data obtained in the image scanner is transferred to the host computer, and the host computer performs shading correction.

As for Arimoto, this reference does not teach or suggest that data, which is different from shading correction data, is stored and outputted. Additionally, Arimoto does not teach or suggest that an image processing apparatus performs image correction, other than for the shading correction, on a shading-corrected image data using correction data transmitted from the image sensing apparatus.

Based on the foregoing, neither Orito nor Arimoto teach or suggest the following: 1) an image sensing apparatus that stores data on image sensing characteristics, which is different from shading correction data, in advance; 2) the outputting of data on the image sensing characteristics to an image processing apparatus; 3) an image processing apparatus that generates image sensing characteristic correction data on the basis of the data for the image sensing characteristics; and 4) the correction of image sensing characteristics of the shading-corrected image data transmitted from the image sensing apparatus.

The Applicants also believe that Kamisuma, Ohta, Sugiura and Taguchi fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Orito and Arimoto. Accordingly, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of Orito, Arimoto, Kamisuma, Ohta, Sugiura and Taguchi, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in the claims of the present invention.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that claims 1 and 15 as well as their dependent claims of the present invention are patentable over the cited prior art.

New Claim 86

Newly added claim 86 is directed to an image processing apparatus similar to that of claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant believes that claim 86 does not add new matter, and is distinguishable over the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4677.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4677.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 09/02/05

By: Mark D. Pratt

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101